



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Christian twins. This being the case, the book is of very little value, though full of ingenious theories.<sup>25</sup>

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

BELMONT, MASS.

#### RECENT BOOKS ON BUDDHISM

What chiefly strikes the observant reader of Dr. Robson's book<sup>1</sup> is that, although it is now in its third edition, the number of errors contained in this little manual would discredit even a first edition. Since the book as a whole is a very neat résumé of what has been learned, and often printed, concerning Hindu religions in the last twenty-five years, it is a pity to have retained such obvious inaccuracies of all kinds as are here collected. Many of these are due to ignorance of Sanskrit, and it may be questioned parenthetically whether a study of Sanskrit works by one incapable of reading them deserves a third edition. But, however that may be, a third edition evidently fills a want, and, in fact, for the missionary it provides an easy path to the knowledge which he could otherwise gain only by the persual of several volumes in several languages. All the more peculiar, it may be added, is the fact that scarcely any authorities are cited.

The book comprises thirteen chapters, only four of which are devoted to the Vedic, Buddhistic, and Jain religions. Modern Hindu philosophy, pantheism, polytheism, caste, the modern sects, Mohammedanism, and finally Christianity in India, with a short sketch of reform movements and an appendix on schools of philosophy, are the topics treated, superficially, but not unsatisfactorily, considering the object of the work, except for the inaccuracies noticed above. It is because such a manual as this is a useful book for those too busy or unlearned to seek knowledge elsewhere that we take pains to enumerate the more glaring defects which a fourth edition can easily remedy. First, the transcription is not only careless but inaccurate. The various sibilants are confused, and so are *y* and *j*. The author, who has evidently drawn his wisdom in part from English and in part from German books (where *y* is transcribed *j*), seems to have discovered this, and in a prefatory note calmly says that *jogī* may be written *yogī*, and "*jāti* or *yāti*" is correct. Consequently he writes *jāti* both for *jāti* ("caste")

<sup>25</sup> That Huz and Buz are twins is not proved at all. Why does Harris (pp. 1, 2) speak of the triad Huppim, Muppim, and Ard, just because in Gen. 46:21 they are mentioned last in the list of the ten sons of Benjamin? Why not speak also of Belah and Becher? And contrast Numb. 26:39, 40. P. 2, below, Tolstoi's famous book is *War and Peace*, by no means *Peace and War*. I wonder whether Pierre, Count Bezuki, a graduate of European universities, should be classed as "a Russian peasant."

<sup>1</sup> *Hinduism and Christianity*. By John Robson. xi + 211. Edinburgh and London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1905. 3s 6d.

and for *yāti* ("ascetic")! As for the three sibilants, it is a mere matter of chance whether he spells a word correctly or not, and among other delicate intimations that the author or proof-reader of this third edition was asleep we have *Soma* for *Sāma*, *Athārva* for *Atharva*, and such sciolistic blunders as *Jaggahnāth* for *Jagannāth*, and *Itihāsa* for *Itihāsa*.

More serious are the attempts at definitions and the historical errors. *Nirvāna* is translated "being without possession" or "being possessed of nothing!" The word means "extinguished," "blown out" (like a lamp), and a blunder like this is inexcusable. In connection with this characteristic word of Buddhism may be noticed the apparent inference that "Buddhism bears witness to the fact that man desires annihilation!" But apparently the author lit on some authority other than that which produced his astounding translation of *Nirvāna*, for on the same page (p. 51) he says that this word has "changed its meaning from a state of absence of desire before death to a state of quiet repose after death." The author attributes "the introduction of the worship of idols into Hinduism" to the influence of Buddhism (p. 54), and yet (p. 35) finds "the worship of images" to be a feature of Hindu religion "before Buddhism appeared." He ascribes the rise and fall of Buddhism to a period subsequent to that of the *Mahābhārata* (p. 34)! Surprising in the account of Buddhism is the crude statement that Buddha, denying the human soul, "taught that, when one being died, he was born again in the sense of the same *parts* being brought together again" (p. 43). Finally, Buddhism was never "expelled" from India (p. 60). Other curiosities are the translation of *Pūrva Mīmāṃsā* as "original decider," and *Uttara* as "second decider," the statement that the *trimūrti* was first "set up" in the fifteenth century (based on an inaccurate reference to Lassen; p. 108), and the further statement that Pushkara is "the only *tīrtha* in India sacred to Brahma."

On the other hand, the remarks on the difference between the Hindu and Christian conceptions of the Trinity are excellent (pp. 68, 107), the exposition of the difference in the Buddhistic and Hindu faith admirable, and the presentation of the later faiths of India clear and succinct. The author's attitude toward the Hindus and their religions, as that of one who seeks to demoralize the foe, is, it may be hoped, due to the same looseness of expression on p. 187 as that which allows him to say "All fruit have" on p. 160. So long, however, as the conversion of India is presented in terms of war it is doubtful whether this is a mere *lapsus linguae*; yet to talk of the "demoralization of the foe" is a bit old-fashioned even in a missionary. It certainly is not the best phrase to plant in the breast of a Christian seeking to win India to Christian belief, and it is to be hoped that Rev. Dr. Robson's desire is in part to inspire the young missionary with a fuller

sympathy for all that is so admirable and beautiful in the great religions of India.

In curious contrast to this work, with its superficial learning and unimpeachable contention that Christianity is a higher religion than that known from Hindu sources, stands the work of Bruno Freydank,<sup>2</sup> with its accurate historical view and superficial contention that Buddhism is the best of all religions and will be "the religion of the future." This is one of a number of similar modern Buddhistic (Theosophical) essays. It is based on modern scholarship, and is generally correct in reiterating what has been said of Buddha by such writers as Oldenberg and Hardy, but it is weak in its chief contention and unfortunately vulgar in tone. Moreover, though the author has drawn for his historical facts on received authorities, his judgment is of the caliber that cites with equal approval the works of Oldenberg and Blavatsky, while his claim that Buddhism today induces an optimistic and happy frame of mind is due to a confusion between what was taught by Buddha and the modern theism which is called Buddhism in Burma, Tibet, and other countries, where "Buddhism" survives in such a form as to be unrecognizable by Buddha himself. The claim that Buddhism is not pessimistic cannot be supported by the statement that Buddha taught his disciples to meet the condition of life with an equable mind, or the evasion, customary to such works, that *Nirvāna* is eternal happiness. There is no happiness for the Buddhist except to be obliterated, to escape life forever. Dogma or revelation, as one will, is the support of the claim of Buddhist and of Christian; but the result is on one side the hope of death, on the other the hope of immortality; except where Buddhism has lost its tenets and become a theosophy, admitting, as in Burma, a supreme God and the expectation of a conscious life hereafter. Freydank devotes a large part of his volume to the rebuttal of the charge that Buddhism is selfish and passive. He urges the sympathy for animals inculcated by Buddhism, and cites the command that one should love all the world. Over against these, he urges as proof of the hard heart of Christianity the burning of witches and the wars of the Crusades! Finally he recognizes the doctrine of Karma as an insight or inspiration of Buddha; but claims that this fundamental doctrine is not necessary to the Buddhist laity. But if this is so, what is left of Buddhism save a highly moral system of ethics? It is a great pity that these rather useless discussions as to the abstract superiority of one of the great religions over the other cannot be conducted in a more gentlemanly manner. The vile and silly epithets which Freydank hurls at Christians (missionaries and pastors seem to be

<sup>2</sup> *Buddha und Christus*. Von Bruno Freydank. Leipzig: Buddhistischer Missions-Verlag, 1903. 192 pages.

his pet aversion) betray a less calm and lovable temper than would have been approved by his acknowledged master.

Freydank's chief opponent is Bertholet, professor of theology in Basel, whose two addresses appear as a pamphlet.<sup>3</sup> The first address is merely a historical sketch, describing the life and teaching of Buddha; but it is not without original features. Thus the loss of personality, but retention of individuality, in the process of Karma is likened, apologetically but cleverly, to a cinematographic series of pictures. His reply to Freydank's and others' claim that Buddhism is essentially altruistic is given in a single anecdote, "Nothing is dearer than one's self" being the dictum propounded and accepted as a matter of course by two eminent Buddhists. Bertholet attacks not only Freydank, but Dahlke, whose two volumes<sup>4</sup> set forth the claim that Buddha alone of all religious teachers has promulgated a system of facts which can be proved, and that Buddhism is "free of all hypotheses." In the second address, Bertholet in a few clear words shows the illogical position of the Buddhist who asserts that he can remember his previous births, and yet has no identity with the former person whose acts alone survive. Further, from a purely logical point of view, where does the Karma doctrine lead to? Its dictum is that there is no existence without previous act. The act of the past conditions the existence of the present. Whence then, inquires Bertholet, came the first existence of that individual whose existence anyway depends always on a precedent act? Whence the act that conditions first existence? I know only that as a product of former acts I exist, and that all existence is sorrow. That is Buddhism, dogmatic, illogical. Is it not also pessimistic? And he says truly that this Buddhistic (pessimistic) view of existence belongs to a people "too weak to feel bravely, too old to feel well." Many historical points obscured by such works as Olcott's "catechism" are here merely touched upon, but left in a clearer light. Such, for example, as the absurd statement of modern Buddhists of the Freydank and Olcott order that women in Buddha's religion "are placed upon an equal footing with men," or that the "compassion" of the Buddhist is equal to the love of the Christian for his kind. Even Dahlke in his *apologia* for Buddhism, mentioned above, characterizes this Buddhistic substitute for Christian love as "cold and colorless" (i, p. 114). In fact, no better description of Buddhistic "altruism" can be found than that contained in Dahlke's

<sup>3</sup> *Der Buddhismus, und seine Bedeutung für unser Geistesleben.* Von Alfred Bertholet. Tübingen und Leipzig: Mohr, 1904. 65 pages. M. 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Aufsätze zum Verständnis des Buddhismus.* Von P. Dahlke. Berlin: Schwetschke, 1903. Two essays: 157 + 137 pages. M. 2.50.

words: "Buddhistic morality is merely a sum in arithmetic set by cool egoism: As much as I give another, so much will accrue to my benefit. . . . Love in Buddha's system *can have no other meaning*" (p. 108). As this frank statement indicates, Dahlke's volumes are of different caliber from that of Freydank, and may be recommended as presenting an honest and sober study of the chief factors in Buddhism, however much the author exploits as the best this system of hypotheses which he mistakingly regards as scientific facts. Dahlke belongs to that coterie of the Occident who, discontented with religious dogma and being really moral atheists, are yet dissatisfied to be without a religion. For such Buddhism is a refuge. They comfort themselves with the thought that they have a religion and at the same time are free of superstition. It is an empty thought, for there is no greater dogma than that of Karma, which connotes an unscientific and improbable substitute for the psychic element, an I that is not I, an I that is act alone, surviving, but in another I, an illogical I that is pure suffering (because act) and yet survives without suffering on the destruction of itself! If this be not dogma, where is dogma found?

With the idea of opposing the modern affectation of Buddhism, Professor Silbernagel, of Munich, lectured a few years ago on the history and content of Buddhism. These lectures have now appeared as a volume.<sup>5</sup> but since they are professedly based on the work of other scholars, they will require no special discussion save in one regard. As Dahlke's clear exposition has been recommended for what it is really worth, so Silbernagel's defense of Christianity, as opposed to Buddhism, though neither original nor particularly brilliant, deserves to be read by those who have given ear exclusively to the Theosophical (Buddhistic) side of this controversy respecting the comparative merits of the two great religions of the world—a controversy which has agitated Germany, though it can scarcely be said to have become active in England or America, where, except in California, native "Buddhists," if they really exist, are rather shy of proclaiming their faith. As Silbernagel says: "Buddhism is a philosophy, not a religion; to appear as a religion it assumes a mask by introducing a cult" (p. 33). As such Buddhism appears in Burma, Tibet, China, etc.; but this is not the religion of Buddha. These theistic developments of Buddhism are very well sketched in Silbernagel's little volume.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

YALE UNIVERSITY,  
New Haven, Conn.

<sup>5</sup> *Der Buddhismus, nach seiner Entstehung, Fortbildung und Verbreitung.* Von Isidor Silbernagel. München: Lentner, 1903. 203 pages. M. 3.